Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting
Date: March 7, 2002   **Time:** 10:00 a.m.
Location: Michigan Information Center, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I.   Approval of February Meeting Minutes

II.   Geographic Framework Program
          A. Repositioning Update / Version 2 Update
     Rob Surber, Michigan Information Center (MIC), the work is 99% complete with the roads
and the orthos. There are a few county lines to finish. All transportation features are being
realigned to at least as good a consistent set of orthos that come from United States Geological
Survey (USGS) and in some cases better photos when available. MIC is moving the
transportation features only and maintaining topology. Wayne County was finished last month.
They have begun doing a little bit of work around the 8 Mile Wayne / Oakland border, but much
of that is complete. The movement of the transportation network will be finished within the next
few days. The intent is to make available a theme of the transportation layer as a prerelease.
Many people use this as a geographic information system (GIS) product and they don't need the
linear referencing. Some of the polygon boundaries will be finalized. The Upper Peninsula and
the northern Lower Peninsula are complete. Also working on getting the new sufficiency data
(main referencing) for the reconciliation process on the trunklines. In May, will put out new
transportation referencing that has been finalized. The Version 2 release with the sufficiency
referencing and polygon information for all counties will be around mid-May. The Ottawa /
Wayne County process went well. MIC integrated into framework Wayne County GIS's
centerline product and the position of Wayne County is going to be better than some of the other
parts of the state where digital orthos were used.
          B. Digital Ortho Update
     Everett Root, MIC, reported that all the USGS ortho photos have been reprojected and copied
to the servers. We now have a complete statewide file.
     Gary Bilow, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), distributed status maps for
the 1992 Series DOQs and the 1998 Series DOQs. MDNR is working on getting the central and
eastern Upper Peninsula in the Hiawatha National Forest from Natural Resources Conversation
Service (NRCS) and a small group near the Indiana border (Berrien and Cass Counties), and the
western Upper Peninsula is still in production. MDNR has applied to USGS for more money
this year to acquire 1998 replacements for 1992 photography, but there isn't any money this
year. MDNR is interested in talking to anybody who would like to contribute money to help
with the purchase. If they only have MDNR funds, they will concentrate on filling in MDNR
lands. They have a priority list and will probably start filling in the Upper Peninsula with the
1998 ortho photography.
          C. National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) Update
     Steve Miller, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), reported that a
workshop is being planned with the participation from USGS headquarters office and their lead
technical person. The workshop is scheduled for April 15-16. The intent is to bring the potential
users of the hydrography layers together to look at what is important to them in terms of
repositioning effort and high resolution National Hydrography Dataset. Want to get feedback to
set guidelines. April 15 will be an overview of the process and showing some uses that have
been made of it and April 16 will be time for feedback. For more information, see Steve Miller
or Rob Surber.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, stated that they are repositioning drain work and lakes in Allegan County and that leads to Kalamazoo River.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, responded that that is a good point and that is something that they will have to address. When talking about the high resolution NHD it is in terms of 1:24,000 using the 1:12,000 orthos just like the transportation network. There is real high-resolution work going on in the counties and need to define how to integrate that in. Need to bring in counties that are doing this work and figure out how to benefit from their work.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that the MiCAMP group is meeting this afternoon and Everett Root and Rob Surber from MIC will be talking to the group to see how the state can better interface with county government.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that it is difficult to estimate how long this project will be, because they need to set parameters and standards. Nobody has taken it through the whole process.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that Oakland County has super high-resolution, but statewide coverage will not be of that accuracy. We will have a consistent statewide coverage that will benefit the majority of users.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that counties are not the working unit for general flow of watersheds. So there is a need to work together and find common ways to integrate information. USGS calls this Local Res.

      D. Routing Server Update

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that MIC has a contract with ESRI to develop a routing server for the framework to give you directions-similar to Map Quest. We have a great product. ESRI has worked with the national companies and are very impress with our product. We want to make the service available to anybody who is using Michigan data.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that school districts spend thousands of dollars on routing services. MIC is dabbling into territory that is heavily controlled by the private sector.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the people asked why not go to the private sector, but we have a better product that will be kept up-to-date which will also be tied into the state's points of interest. It may not make money for the state, but it states that product that has been behind the scenes has a very tangible above the surface value. Even if it says at the bottom that it is "Brought to you by the Geographic Framework Program" that would say enough and that is one of the key reasons why this project has been done. Most people, when they think about Internet and maps think about the private sector.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, stated that nothing prevents a private company from coming in a paying a fair price that has been established by an Enhanced Access Policy and duplicating this work on their server.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded nothing.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that hopefully people in the group will communicate what options are available. This is an opportunity for local government to leverage a service through a partnership with the state to support their local user community. Right now the private sector is grabbing state data on a daily basis, repackaging it and selling it. Nothing is really different – it is just how smart are we in the user community.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if this is an online product and if it is being linked through michigan.gov.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that it is an online product. There is a new initiative with eMichigan, michigan.gov, to create the Map MI Product (a tool to provide routing from every business area on the portal). It is a combined statewide effort. MIC has statewide trunkline information regarding turn restrictions. For local One-Ways will try to work with local units of government as an attribution. National products often route you the wrong way for One-Ways.

This is an advantage with governments working together, this will be the best product possible. Have also been in discussion with MDOT to obtain fairly recent construction information tied in – with start and stop dates. The routing server will have the capability to upload and update. It is not and ITS operation (lane closed, etc.), but a general service to advise of dirt being moved etc. Will not give alternative routes.

Tammi Shepherd, Wayne County, stated that they are having discussions with GDT, who is interested in obtaining local information to code on Wayne County's framework product. There are vendors who, if you give them the maps, will do the work for free.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that there are no surprises that the private sector is interested in this, but they are not going to promote framework. He added that we need to continue to communicate. This is new for ESRI – they have never done this before. More and more states and governments are creating centerline products and private vendors will not want to lose. They will want to use government data for their products. Being able to customize local of state data for routing capabilities. They are creating a template that will probably is a business move and will probably have a wizard at some point to take data and upload. Up to this point they don't have that and that is why the MIC has entered into agreement with them. The only players have been the national players. We have to look at doing customized regional network tie-ins to the framework. If looking at the travel community, at least the mid-west, how do they get into the network. Also working with ESRI and Map MI to tie in points of interest information that collected for state agencies, state government buildings, state libraries, all facilities and unique points of interest (cider mills, waterfalls). Want to have control of what state government is interesting in the state, regardless of what a private company feels is important. Also working a ways to keep data up-to-date. By working with local governments, hope to explore local points of interest. Not necessarily a county's distributable file, but county parks and other county points of interest.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, stated people may want to find environmental sites in an area, but will need address ranges.

   E. Address Ranges

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that Alden Leatherman, MIC, has been working on a process to link current 2000 TIGER Line ID to bring over any non-conflicting address ranges from the 2000 TIGER as a starting point to fill in areas where the framework does not have address ranges. When the conflation process began, used the 1994 TIGER IDs that were available at the time. The Census Bureau has done additional work on their road network and so has the MIC. So there are quite a few features in the file that have a road name and are topologically correct and are now repositioned, but have no address ranges. TIGER has also added so they have a TIGER Line ID and address ranges. A program has been created to link on common segments based on intersection names. Have been able to match quite a few in and are now tweaking that process. Hoping to create additional TIGER Line ID links, but in addition – bring in address ranges. This is a way to populate the Version 2 release in May. This will not slow a Version 2 release. MIC plans to send an updated file to the Census Bureau with the additional address ranges.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, stated that they have been looking at the address range for some time. At the beginning they had support software (which the department found very useful with their facility profiler) and have purchased an ongoing subscription. The department is looking at standardizing information that comes in.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that MIC has been looking at the issue as well, but it has been put on back burner in order to work on populating automatically. MIC would like to create a ZIP+4 link into the framework. That is a larger task, but it is a useful one. Looking at linkages between the Street Index, which is also another useful source.

Joe Kogelman, U.S. Bureau of the Census, asked about bringing in information address ranges that were not conflicting with current framework address, so if there is conflict it will not come in under the automated process.

Rob Surber, MIC, added MIC is only bringing in data for fields that have a zero field in framework. MIC also checks conflicts to see if it is overlapping something down the road or parity.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked if MIC distinguishes between private and public roads in the address process.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that this is range base and not individual address points. An on-going process of looking closely at these ranges is going to be part of framework maintenance. At this point, they are trying to get a quick win with bulk update. This will not hold up Version 2, but will include what can safely be put in.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if it is being developed A to B or if there is potential for uploading a list of addresses.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that it will be up to the MIC to decide. Will start simple with A to B, but can expand. The routing server is a series of binary files that allows for return directions and figure the least path. It does not control up front interface from what has been collected. The state site is going to indicate the unique things in the state. It could be a pick list.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if it is based on IMS.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that IMS is going to be the access. The routing services is a separate application to create the route and upload. If MIC gets updates construction information, it will be input to this program. If framework creates a version at a certain rate, MIC can update it overnight with a complete new network. A prototype will be available next Friday on the Internet to begin acceptance testing on. The Map MI will be available some time this summer.

F. Imagery Workshop

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that a workshop in conjunction with NASA has been on hold until new administration and new budget came in. The money is available now for NE Affliliates to conduct a workshop and NASA would like to start working with the states. The goal was to do it in conjunction before or after a conference. Not going to make this IMAGIN conference. MiCAMP could be a potential or next year to possibly do it with IMAGIN. It is important to do. Rob is on the planning committee and will advise the group as he learns more. The skeleton agenda will have types of imagery and what can be done with it. The goal is to start getting local imagery. It is an educational approach as NASA wants people using them, making applications with them, and they want the states to facilitate that.

Mike Hass, Branch County GIS, asked what ever came of working with SPOT to try to get 3-meter imagery.

Gary Bilow, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, responded that it didn't fit any of the scales.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that NASA is partnering with different groups. If they can't meet the requirements, they will be brokering other data. They are reinventing themselves.

III.   Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Gary Bilow, MDNR, reported that the beginning of their geographic information system (GIS) project solicitation process from their field staff. It has been out for about a week and they have received 10 proposals. They are expecting a bigger pile of papers to go through this year than in past years. It is partly because their staff is becoming familiar GIS and its possibilities. They are also working on a delivering a GIS-Based Decision Support System for their Forest

Managers and plan to deliver it by Window Terminal Services over the network. Initial tests have been positive.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if that is being developed in-house or contracted.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, responded that the platform is being developed in-house; the idea is from a vendor as a solution to delivering this geographic support system.

IV.   Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, displayed a map with their Version 1B with all their attribution on it. It is up on the network and in the office so that anyone in the building can bring up the state map and zero in on where they want to go. They can see these layers and a few more. There was a question as to how they update the rail. She responded that they work with MIC.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that they are working a pilot area right now. MIC is not taking away anything that is on the topographic maps. But this is a central place to get a current inventory. They are trying to discover what they know and don't know. The workload is not much if you have good information.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they are discussing what they want to add this coming year. The goal is to bring up-to-date to 2001, the roads that were the least compatible with the ACT 51 certification that was done in 1999. They are working on 2002 certification. They will be getting that information to MIC with all the changes that took place for 2-3 years. The goal this coming year to send framework maps to locals for their changes. They know that the repositional accuracy will be nice for MDOT to do that. There are some roads that are ACT 51 certified that are not in framework. In some cases, there are suspicions that some roads do not exist any more, but can't address all those issues at this time. ACT 51 maps are not positional accurate either. MDOT's ACT 51 engineer is meeting with Michigan State Industries (MSI) to see if they can provide services to help MDOT to make that sure that after updating it as close to ACT 51 map so that the department can stand behind it. The counties and cities get paid by mileage and framework mileage will not match what the locals have for mileage. There may be more or less in some cases.

Tammy Shepherd, Wayne County, commented that their GIS Department did a test with ACT 51 certification mileage and GIS mileage and it was within 1-2 mile difference.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that in most counties, they are very close, but in some counties were not as close, but there could have been a year's difference.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the repositioning gives a new level of positional consistency and accuracy.

Carol Woodman, Michigan State Industries (MSI), stated that they had an agreement that if it was within .1 mile or 528 feet of ACT 51 map said that it should be – if it wasn't it was marked and they made comments. They made two files one with the regular county and one marked "NEW" and suggested that this is the way the ACT 51 is versus the framework. Then the county can compare and decide at their level.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that when money is involved not everyone wants to go to the most reasonable solution.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that we couldn't lose the fact that they are the ones who certify. There are going to be new tools (RoadSoft and others) available.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that as a state agency can question mileage but cannot tell them that it is wrong.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that MIC is going to be very careful in their approach in their attention to detail in Metadata. There will be case numbers and differences will be well documented – this will accompany the maps. MIC is not going to necessarily integrate transactions to the features MIC cannot find. There is going to be a layer that connects so a

cartographic product can be created that has a complete picture with coding that indicates case numbers including comments. Will not totally integrate roads that cannot find as a part of the official framework, but will have them connected and will be produced as ACT 51 map. Sees this from the GIS community and the data integration perspective as a significant change, because this ties into a formal process of state and local relationship. From the data user perspective in the GIS community, this is a positive thing.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that there are current attempts to get asset management passed. This will require that certain data be collected on a consistent basis, at least for all federal aid roads.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the Census Bureau (through TIGER Modernization) because of official legalities behind ACT 51 may allow them not to have to go to every jurisdiction and work with the state directly. It is already being officially collected (similar to boundary annexation that is signed off by the counties and officially recorded at the Office of the Great Seal).

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they have installed the Map Image Viewer on one of their servers and are reviewing its possibilities.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities

Steve Miller, MDEQ, reported that the new version of the Map Image Viewer has been rolled out to the counties for the Drinking Water Protection. It is getting the viewer and the data into the hands of the local Health Departments. There have been a lot of enhancements made to the viewer to create shape files and integrate in the lithology of the well records. MDEQ duplicated some capabilities of the geology program.

Rob Surber, MIC, pointed out that these are local installs. Has MDEQ ever had an application that they served something over the web from a server.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that they took this route – first was the IMAP application. They are rolling stuff out over the Internet. They found that many local health departments' staff does not have access to the Internet. Once the data is put in the hands of the locals it has become an ordinate data base, but MDEQ has made provisions for updates.

Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, added that they are working both ends of the viewer. Some components that initially built for the view are going up on the web site for the coordinate conversion activities. Once the geology program becomes stabilized in the viewer, it may become part of the ArcIMS application as well.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if the viewer could run directly through the server through a Citrex application.

Bill Enslin, MSU, responded that it would need a lot of redesign. All the data can reside on the server, but the application needs to be installed on a separate system.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that John Clark, MDEQ, developed an extension for ArcVIEW to create cross sections from the Well Logic data. It is a very powerful extension. It is being distributed free.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that SAIC is populating the MSP server with data. They have just finished the Business Process Approved Initiatives, which has reengineered the business processes of the MSP. GIS has gotten good visibility because there was a lot of mapping analysis.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Carol Woodman, MSI, reported that MSI built a program for a sample county and populated it with data needed and brought up scanned images for MDOT's "As Built" program. This will be presented, along with another program to MDOT today. MSI will also go over ideas to help MDOT's staff check ACT 51. MSI is also doing a parcel project for Sault Ste. Marie, MI. Unsure how that information will get back to the Michigan Information Center.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that the state is not collecting parcels at the moment.

Everett Root, MIC, added that Sault Ste. Marie is also doing a 9-1-1 project and they are looking at repositioning framework.

VIII.   MIC Projects and Activities
        A. Qualified Voter File (QVF) Street Index Redistricting

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that over the next two months MIC will completely re-index the Street Index to the new congressional senate/house legislative precincts. This is not a map database, but is a comprehensive listing of all streets in the state. The new boundaries are being captured via maps, but are being input via new update mechanism. It is one place to get all kinds of cross reference information to new legislative precincts.

IX.   MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that they gave a new version of the Map Image Viewer to Family Independence Agency (FIA). This version has the data import capability allowing them to pull down extracts from Excel spreadsheets from their data warehouse and immediately double click to make an ESRI point shape file. It will automatically display the points in the viewer itself. There are five analysts who will start training and they will be interested in routing.

Rob Surber, MIC, noted that FIA is looking at reorganizing how they do business. One data set is the elementary school boundaries – they would like to have them mapped. This is a statewide data set that many people may be interested in. FIA may align all business processes with school attendance areas.

Bill Enslin, MSU, added that currently to set up FIA clients, they use an interactive terminal that goes to a main frame. When they type in an address, it goes to Postal Soft software, which provides coordinate. In the future they would like to take the coordinate to get school district or other geography and have it filled in immediately. In the long term, they are thinking about how they assign their clients. The new features that are more general in use would be of use to a wider audience. An example is the point digitizing routine allows recording locations and attributes of emergency spills. This has more usefulness with the backdrop imagery so you can locate precisely locate where the features are – can create a point shape file from those. Can also do queries of subset of records and create a shape file – points, lines, or areas. MSU has done a lot to simplify the viewer and serve a number of different uses. There was a limit of 13 user layers and now there are 32,000. They have added thematic classification capability.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, thanked MDNR for posting the quads on the Internet. MSU downloaded them and is using them the way they were intended, in Michigan GeoRef. Pat Smith, Eaton County, spent two days converting one quarter quad (QQ) to ArcINFO. There is some work that needs to be done to make it usable, perhaps cut by township. Kathleen expects to spend the next 6 months to a year on the hydrology layer, which has gotten much more integrated. The infrareds (IR) are awesome for seeing water. They started working with their USDA representative to do a 2000 Land Use from his color air slides, but now have the '99s on the Internet. The '78 Land Use is awful at the level they are using it. It is on MIRIS and positionally it is terrible. Kathleen will be recovering from the digital orthos that she knew were coming, but not this quickly. She stumbled onto them.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that there is probably a lot of counties that do not know about them.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that MIC is looking at the information availability issue.

X.   County / Local Projects and Activities

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, reported that he purchased a Map Image Viewer program. Thinks that this is going to be the single most important piece of software for locals. Jeroen is making a sales pitch to locals. The novice will not get discouraged within two minutes. The implications will be huge from a financial and use point of view to promote the adoption of GIS technology.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that is precisely why MIC got involved with Bill Enslin's Map Image Viewer – to make it GIS for the masses.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that they are trying to substitute all their in-house data and get it to work. It had virtually no limitations.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if Jeroen will look at ways of getting locals to explore how this can be promoted.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that there was a state Epidemiologist Biohazard GIS position. Curious whether: A. the position is going to be there B. what the person will do C. what it means at the county level. Jeroen talked with Aaron Burk, Livingston County GIS, who is hot about the Michigan high-speed initiative – Link Michigan.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that MIC provided a lot of information integration in geographic form for Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) and Department of Information Technology (D.I.T.) when they came up with the Request for Proposal (RFP). The private sector is laying down fiber and there are issues related to them wanting to let people know where those are.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that one of the fundamental handicaps that the state has at getting that type of information, especially if it is private hands, is access. The governor did personally influence getting a generalized picture of what is out there in order to present it for an RFP. The legislation calls for broadband authority. How the authority is composed and is then able to leverage detail information from the private sector, will come together on an enterprise basis. The locals may have access to where the lines are. The state has to get to a position where they can actually leverage the detail information.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that he thinks that if there is a chance that reasons were related to Homeland Defense or that type of reason, we would be able to access info.

Eric Nischan, Michigan State Police (MSP), added that s looking at these issues in the Emergency Management Division since they do not have authority to get the information they need.

Mike Hass, Branch County GIS/MSUE, asked if the Michigan Department of Agriculture (MDA) could develop GIS files depicting PA 116 statewide lands. It would be of great benefit.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, added that it would also be helpful they also make sure that their list is up-to-date.

Mike Hass, Branch County, asked if there is any discussion in the state about using Light Detection and Ranging System (LIDARS) for elevation.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, responded that in Ottawa County they use LIDARS for the Macatawa and did floor plain mapping. They are continually evaluating that in terms of looking for the flood plain. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has flown the whole state. John Clark, MDEQ, is very interested in it. The processes are down pretty good now and it is in a usable format.

Mike Hass, Branch County, stated that they have been doing parcels and are now beginning to explore. The mode of the program is going from a state purchase to funding a local program. If your local government isn't set up with that local unit, then they won't be in line for state money. The data would be nice because part of the process is ranking parcels and a way to get a high ranking is if your ground is anywhere near land that has already been put in the program.

Tammi Shepherd, Wayne County, reported that before they sent out the ortho RFP for Wayne County, they changed it to flying the county for 2002. The RFPs are being reviewed. Hope to have a contract by this spring. There are 800,000 parcels in Wayne County. Framework is lower on the priority list as they are working on parcels. Their DPS has classified ownership of the roads.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that state government also did work. The work should match because it was certified when given to MDOT.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that this is something that will need to be reviewed.

Tammi Shepherd, Wayne County, stated that they are missing some ACT 51 roads with the new construction at the airport. They are doing physical reference (PR) work – want to start working with a linear reference system.

Mark Klute, St. Joseph County, reported that they received their RFP back for adjusting their road centerlines and it looks like they are going to go with the ortho photos. There is a strong likelihood that they will go with redoing the orthos. The Map Image Viewer will be the answer to the Acrobat Reader approach – it is a step up that allows real geographic information. They are waiting for the bugs to be worked out. The biggest problem with the locals is that from a technology standpoint GIS is way over their heads. There are too many acronyms. Once they have a GIS Acrobat Reader, they will feel more comfortable.

XI.   Regional Projects and Activities

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, reported that they are still working on the 2000 Land Use updates and putting the 2000 census block attributes on the framework.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that they would like to discuss the SEMCOG process and how much time it took.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, stated that they are half way through they are finding ways to make it more efficient. A week from today they will be hosting the Regional GIS Coordination Committee Meeting. The executive director of URISA is going to speak about their proposed GIS certification. It is an open meeting and all are welcome.

Abbi Mueller, West Michigan Regional Planning Commission (WMRPC), reported that they are working on the Ottawa County shoreline study. They are looking at all the master plans and projecting them into the future.

XII.   Federal Projects and Activities
A. United States Geological Survey (USGS) – Aquatic GAP

Steve Aichele, USGS, reported that Terrestrial GAP (Gap Analysis Project) is to identify high value habitats in the state. Now there is the development of the Aquatic GAP is to identify high value aquatic habitats. This is note worthy because it is going to happen in Michigan and because it is one of the first major applications of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). It is developed to work with 1:100,000 data, which will be done in Michigan because there will be a Great Lakes basin-wide standard Dataset. They are trying to get a comparison of what results would be like for 24,000 for selected basins. This could be of significant value to some state

agencies (fisheries, land and water quality, and land and water management). Trying to organize and stakeholders meeting March 27 at the Great Lakes Science Center, Ann Arbor. Mike Donovan, MDNR, is the Terrestrial GAP coordinator for Michigan. The Biological Resources Division in Ann Arbor drives the Aquatic GAP project.

Joe Kogelman, U. S. Bureau of the Census, reported that they have been instructed to contact state, regional, or local jurisdictions for every county to ascertain what digital file materials they each have. It seems redundant to check any farther than the MIC, but necessary to confirm. MIC provided materials earlier, but has not gotten any feedback yet. The bureau is to call and ask 140 questions to get detailed information about their data. It is theoretically based on a homeland security approach. The USGS is also calling and they are unsure if they are using the same questionnaire. The Bureau will start another testing in three Michigan counties (Lake, Otsego, Houghton) trying to do enumeration without using paper maps, but using a framework like product that contains the framework and the master address file.

XIII. Other Issues

Next Meeting Date
April 4, 2002, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Information Center, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933

** If any changes or corrections are to be made to these minutes, please contact the Michigan Information Center at (517) 373-7910. Changes and corrections will be noted on the final copy to be post